

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Non-final office action of March 8, 2006 has been reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claim 1 and 16 have been amended. Claims 1-7 and 22-27 are canceled. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 8, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Parks (U.S. Patent No. 5,455,466). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8, as amended, recites a battery connector for connecting the battery of the host device with the direct current, the battery of the host device being separate from the battery pack. Parks fails to teach or suggest this feature. Rather, Parks merely discloses a portable electronic device 12 (col. 3, lines 28-29, FIGS. 1 and 2) containing a battery charging circuit (224, FIG. 2) for recharging a battery 225 of the device 12 (FIG. 2). Notably, the battery 225 of Parks is integrated into the battery charger. Therefore, Parks also fails to teach or suggest a battery connector for connecting the battery of the host device since the integrated battery need not be connected to the battery pack.

Therefore, the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 8 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 8.

Claims 8-10, 12, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lyon (U.S. Patent Pub No. 2004/0145342). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8, as amended, recites a battery connector for connecting the battery of the host device with the direct current, the battery of the host device being separate from the battery pack. Lyon fails to teach or suggest this feature. Rather, Lyon merely discloses a Battery

Driven Device 204 (FIG. 2) containing a battery 234 (FIG. 2). The battery 234 of Lyon is integrated within the battery driven device 204 and is not separate from a battery charger. Therefore, Lyon also fails to teach or suggest the connector for receiving a portion of the battery pack. This is because the battery of Lyon is integrated into the device. Therefore, a connector is not used in Lyon.

Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 10, 12, 13, and 15 depend from claim 8 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 8.

Rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon in view of Gosior (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0159434). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-7 have been canceled. Claims 28-30 depend from claim 8. As set forth above, Lyon fails to teach or suggest claim 8. Gosior fails to cure the deficits of Lyon. The Office Action asserts that Gosior discloses a polling message. Even assuming *arguendo* that the Office Action's assertion is correct, Gosior still fails to teach or suggest a battery connector for connecting the battery of the host device with the direct current, the battery of the host device being separate from the battery pack. Nor does the Office Action assert that Gosior does.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 13, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parks in view of Stobbe (U.S. Pat. No. 6,275,143). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 9, 13, and 15 depend from claim 8. As set forth above, Parks fails to teach or suggest claim 1. Stobbe fails to cure the deficits of Parks. The Office Action asserts that Stobbe a digital security signature and an antenna. Even assuming *arguendo* that the Office

Action's assertion is correct, Gosior still fails to teach or suggest claim 8. Nor does the Office Action assert that Gosior does. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parks in view of Garcia (U.S. Pat. No. 5,963,012). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parks in view of Higuchi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,163,132). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 12 and 14 depend from claim 8. As set forth above, Parks fails to teach or suggest claim 8. Higuchi and/or Garcia fail to cure the deficits of Parks. The Office Action asserts that Higuchi discloses a indicating receiving inductive energy and Garcia discloses a plurality of charging parameters. Even assuming *arguendo* that the Office Action's assertions are correct, Higuchi and Garcia still fail to teach or suggest claim 8. Nor does the Office Action assert that Higuchi and/or Garcia do. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-19 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon in view of Gosior. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 22-24 have been canceled. Claim 16, as amended, recites the battery being separate from the battery pack and transmitting the direct current to charge the battery. Lyon discloses a battery that is integrated with the battery pack (FIG. 2). Gosior fails to teach or suggest a battery pack at all. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-19 depend from claim 16 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for claim 16.

Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lyon in view of Gosior and further in view of Higuchi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 16. As set forth above, the combination of Lyon and Gosior fails to teach or suggest claim 16. Higuchi fails to cure the deficits of Lyon and Gosior. The Office Action asserts that Higuchi discloses indicating receiving inductive

